



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the Application of

Jerry JOHNSON et al

Group Art Unit: 2165

Serial No.: 10/705,923

Examiner: J. Veillard

Filed: November 13, 2003

Confirmation No.: 7308

For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR CREATION AND MAINTENANCE OF A RICH-CONTENT OR CONTENT-CENTRIC ELECTRONIC CATALOG

RESPONSE TO ELECTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Office Action mailed July 7, 2006, the period for response being extended by the accompanying petition and fee therefore, applicants make the following election.

In response to the election of species requirement, applicants elect the Group I invention, i.e., claims 1-16, 30, 45-75 and 82-88 (drawn to a method and system for creating and maintaining a rich-content repository by providing a common language for defining a schema wherein the provided common language defining the schema has been used by a standard database structure defined by a standard schema).

This election is made with traverse.

In the present application, although claims to distinct and independent inventions are included, the search for the Group I-III claims together would not be burdensome, since the

subject matter of the Groups is closely related and pertinent art to the claims of the identified Groups would likely be found while searching each of the inventions individually.

As the Examiner is instructed in MPEP §803:

"If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

Moreover, from the standpoint of costs to the Applicants involved in filing, issuance and maintenance fees relating to separate applications if the present Restriction Requirement is maintained, it is clear that there is substantially more burden on Applicants by imposing the present Requirement than on the Patent Office if the Requirement were withdrawn.

In addition, it is noted that to require the claims of the various Groups to issue in separate patents would result in inconvenience to the public by necessitating reference to more than one patent during searching, in order to review closely related subject matter.

Therefore, withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement is warranted.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 31465A

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088
Date: August 29, 2006